

# Efficient classical simulation of the semi-classical Quantum Fourier Transform

Daniel E. Browne\*

Department of Materials and Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3PU, UK

A number of elegant approaches have been developed for the identification of quantum circuits which can be efficiently simulated on a classical computer. Recently, these methods have been employed to demonstrate the classical simulability of the quantum Fourier transform (QFT). In this note, we show that one can demonstrate a number of simulability results for QFT circuits in a straightforward manner using Griffiths and Niu's semi-classical QFT construction [Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3228 (1996)]. We then discuss the consequences of these results in the context of Shor's factorisation algorithm.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 03.67.Mn, 42.50.Dv

An important part of understanding the power of quantum computation relative to its classical counterpart is the identification of those circumstances where both classical and quantum computation have equal power. One important aspect of this is to identify quantum circuits which can be efficiently simulated on a classical computer, particularly when these circuits play a role in quantum algorithms believed to have an exponential advantage.

The standard description of a quantum computation consists of the following steps. A register of quantum bits (qubits) is initialised in a certain state; Then a sequence of unitary quantum gates (the quantum circuit) are applied. Finally, each of the qubits is measured. The *output* of a quantum computation is thus a classical bit string. This output is not usually determinate – rather bitstrings are returned by a quantum computation according to a particular probability distribution. We will say that a device which outputs bitstrings distributed according to this same probability distribution is *simulating* the quantum computation. Of particular interest are simulations on classical computers which are *efficient*. This means that the resources needed to run the simulation (runtime, memory, etc.) scale polynomially (or at the very least sub-exponentially) with the size of the problem, usually the number of qubits taking part in the quantum circuit. We shall call a family of quantum circuits acting on a given family of input states *classically simulable* when an efficient method is known for its simulation on a classical computer.

Several classes of quantum circuit are known to be classically simulable when an appropriate simulation strategy is adopted. For example, classically simulable circuits include those consisting of Clifford group gates acting on input qubits in state  $|0\rangle$  [1], circuits with restricted topological and depth properties [2, 3, 4] acting on product state inputs and circuits where the entanglement is limited at every stage [5, 6].

These simulation strategies share a common feature – the identification of a suitable classical data structure to efficiently store the state or circuit, with efficient rules to update and evaluate it. In the state vector formalism, where states are represented as vectors of complex amplitudes and unitary operators as square matrices, families of circuits over increasing numbers of qubits cannot generally be efficiently simulated, since the size of vectors and matrices increases exponentially. Nevertheless, Jozsa and Linden showed [5] that certain classes of

quantum circuit remain simulable in this framework, provided the entanglement in the states is restricted in a way that we shall describe below.

Recently, other data structures have been proposed. These include the stabilizer formalism [1], the matrix product state description [6, 7] and the weighted graph state [8] approach, each giving an efficient representation of multi-qubit states, and efficient tensor network descriptions [2, 3, 4] of quantum circuits. Each of these approaches has led to new examples of quantum circuits which are classically simulable.

Very recently, the classical simulability of the quantum Fourier transform has been investigated [9, 10]. The quantum Fourier transform (QFT) [11] (over the field  $\mathbb{Z}_{2n}$ ) is an important family of quantum operations. It plays a special role in quantum computation theory, forming a key part of Shor's factoring algorithm [11]. The  $n$ -qubit QFT coherently transforms an input state  $|x\rangle$  in the computational basis as follows;

$$|x\rangle \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_y e^{-\frac{i2\pi}{n}xy} |y\rangle \quad (1)$$

where  $|x\rangle$  represents a qubit-string  $|x_1 \dots x_n\rangle$ .

A family of quantum circuits which efficiently realise this operation [12] are illustrated in figure 1. Other circuit implementations of the QFT have been proposed. Coppersmith [13] noted that the size of the controlled phase-rotations in figure 1 get progressively smaller to the point where their effect on the final state is insignificant. By neglecting these small rotations, one can produce an approximate QFT circuit with an output which has a high-fidelity compared to that of the exact circuit, but with a reduced number of gates. Cleve and Watrous [14] proposed an approximate QFT circuit which can be parallelized to depth logarithmic in  $n$ .

We shall call a unitary *terminating* if it occurs at the end of a circuit, immediately preceding the (computational basis) measurement of all qubits. In Shor's algorithm, the QFT is terminating. Griffiths and Niu [15] observed that when a controlled unitary is immediately followed by a measurement on the control qubit, a coherent two-qubit implementation of the gate is not necessary. Instead, one can measure the control qubit before the target qubit, and use the measurement result as a classical control to determine whether to apply the single-qubit



Matrix product states are states which can be written in the following manner [3, 4, 7].

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=0}^1 C_{i_1 \dots i_n} |i_1\rangle \cdots |i_n\rangle \quad (3)$$

where the coefficients  $C_{i_1 \dots i_n}$  can be represented in matrix product form

$$C_{i_1 \dots i_n} = \text{Tr}[M_1^{(i_1)} M_2^{(i_2)} \cdots M_i^{(i_n)}] \quad (4)$$

where  $M_1^{(i_1)}, M_2^{(i_2)}, \dots, M_n^{(i_n)}$  are a set of matrices. The dimensions of each matrix is  $D_i \times D_{i+1}$ . The value  $D_i$  represents the Schmidt number [6] over the partition of the state between qubit  $(i-1)$  and  $(i)$ . We label the maximal Schmidt number over all such partitions as  $\chi$ . The total number of parameters describing the state scales as  $O(n\chi^2)$ . If a family of states over increasing number of qubits  $n$  is bounded in  $\chi$  then it can be efficiently represented in this framework.

Let us consider the action of the  $n$ -qubit terminating quantum Fourier transform on a set of input states with a matrix product state description with bounded  $\chi$ . Vidal [6] and Yoran and Short [3] showed that to update a matrix product state description under the action of a single qubit unitary gate requires  $O(\chi^2)$  elementary operations [6] and does not increase  $\chi$ . In addition, to update the MPS description after a computational basis measurement on one of the qubits [3] requires  $O(n\text{poly}(\chi))$  operations. Referring back to Niu and Griffiths' circuit we thus see that the action of the terminating QFT on a family of MPS input states with bounded  $\chi$  is classically simulable.

Graph states [16] are a generalisation of the cluster states introduced by Briegel and Raussendorf [17]. Each state is associated with a graph consisting of vertices and edges connecting vertex pairs. Every vertex on the graph is associated with a qubit prepared in state  $|+\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ . The graph state associated with the graph is generated by application of controlled- $\sigma_z$  gates between all each pair of qubits whose vertices are connected on the graph.

Single-qubit measurements on certain classes of graph states are universal for quantum computation [18]. However single qubit measurements on families of graph states with certain topologies e.g. for graphs which are one-dimensional [19] or square lattice graph states with logarithmic width [3, 20] the evolution of the state under single-qubit measurements can be efficiently classically simulated. Since the terminating QFT can itself be implemented with adaptive single-qubit measurements, the same reasoning applies and with all such classes of graph states as input, the terminating QFT will be classically simulable.

**Discussion.** Since the *terminating* QFT is shown to be classically simulable for such a wide range of input states, one may ask whether this can be exploited for the efficient simulation of Shor's algorithm. In Shor's algorithm, states generated from a modular exponentiation circuit (applied to a uniform superposition of computational basis states) are fed into a terminating QFT.

The results above tell us that if the quantum states returned by the modular exponentiation belonged to any of the classes of states considered above, then in that case, the factorisation algorithm would be classically simulable. In [5] Jozsa and Linden consider the possibility of such states being  $p$ -blocked. They find that the modular exponentiation does, indeed, *typically* generate non- $p$ -blocked states, i.e. with entanglement ranging over an unbounded number of qubits. It is interesting to note that their argument does not prove that there are not special cases where  $p$ -blocked states do arise.

It is worth discussing what implications these results have for our understanding of where the non-classical power of Shor's algorithm lies. These results throw into relief the importance of the entanglement properties of the states generated by the first stage of the algorithm - the modular exponentiation. One should not, however, rush to consider modular exponentiation alone to be the more important stage of the algorithm. This would be overhasty, not the least because modular exponentiation is also, when terminating, a classically simulable operation. This is easy to see, by recalling that the input state to the modular exponentiation is a uniform superposition of all  $n$ -bit string states. The output of the modular exponentiation is the state  $\sum_x |f(x)\rangle$ . A computational basis measurement on the output register will reveal one of the bit strings  $f(x)$ , which will occur with probability  $2^{-n}$ . Thus an efficient classical simulation strategy is immediately apparent - one chooses a particular classical input string  $x$  according to the probability distribution of the input state (in this case a uniform distribution), and then one calculates  $f(x)$  classically. This emphasises that it is the coherent interface between the modular exponentiation and the QFT which allows Shor's algorithm to exhibit its (believed) speed-up.

**Conclusion.** We have shown that Griffiths and Niu's semiclassical construction of the terminating quantum Fourier transform gives a simple way to understand why the QFT, when considered in isolation, is classically simulable. Leveraging results from the literature, we have used the same approach to show that for a wide variety of classes of input state (with efficient classical description) this simulability property remains. The methods here could be applied to any terminating circuit which can be implemented via single-qubit measurement and adaptive single qubit unitaries. These results illustrate the special status of operations occurring in the terminating position in a quantum circuit for questions of simulability and highlight that component circuits that are individually classically simulable can still be combined to form circuits with an apparent quantum speed up. We hope that they also help shed a little more light on the fascinating question of from where quantum computation does and *does not* get its power.

We would like to thank Richard Jozsa, Tony Short and Nadav Yoran for inspiring discussions and in particular to the latter two for giving early access to the results presented in [10]. This was supported by funding from Merton College, Oxford and the EPSRC's QIPIRC.

---

\* Electronic address: daniel.browne@merton.ox.ac.uk

- [1] D. Gottesman, pre-print quant-ph/9807006.
- [2] I. Markov and Y. Shi, pre-print quant-ph/0511069.
- [3] N. Yoran and A.J. Short, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 170503 (2006).
- [4] R. Jozsa, pre-print quant-ph/0603163.
- [5] R. Jozsa and N. Linden, Proc. Royal Soc. A **459**, 2011 (2003).
- [6] G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 147902 (2003).
- [7] S. Rommer and S. Ostlund Phys. Rev. B **55**, p.2164 (1997).
- [8] S. Anders, M.B. Plenio, W. Dr, F. Verstraete and H.-J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 107206 (2006).
- [9] D. Aharonov, Z. Landau and J. Makowsky, pre-print quant-ph/0611156.
- [10] N. Yoran and T. Short, pre-print quant-ph/0611241.
- [11] P.W. Shor, SIAM Journal on Computing **26** p. 1484 (1997).
- [12] A. Ekert and R. Jozsa, Phil. Trans. of the Royal Soc. A **356**, 1769 (1988).
- [13] D. Coppersmith, pre-print quant-ph/0201067.
- [14] R. Cleve and J. Watrous, 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 526 (2000).
- [15] R.B. Griffiths and C.-S. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3228 (1996).
- [16] M. Hein *et al.*, e-print quant-ph/0602096.
- [17] H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 910 (2001).
- [18] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001); D.E. Browne and H.J. Briegel, pre-print quant-ph/0603226.
- [19] M.A. Nielsen, pre-print quant-ph/0504097.
- [20] M. Van den Nest, W. Dür, G. Vidal, H. J. Briegel, pre-print: quant-ph/0608060.